

**Clinical Trials Management Systems Workspace  
Face-to-Face Meeting**

**Oregon Health & Science University**

**SESSION: Plenary: The caBIG™ Data Sharing & Intellectual Capital Workspace and the  
caBIG™ Security Working Group – Objectives and Role in Relation to CTMS**

<b>Session Information</b>	<p><b>Date: May 30, 2007</b>  <b>Time: 11:30am – 12:30pm PDT</b>  <b>Presenter/Lead: Wendy Patterson &amp; George Komatsoulis</b>  <b>Facilitator: Meg Gronvall</b>  <b>Scribe: Julie Holtzople</b></p>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<p>Wendy Patterson provided a presentation on the caBIG™ Data Sharing and Intellectual Capital (DSIC) Workspace. Key highlights included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Review of key caBIG™ principles and the roles of DSIC</li> <li>○ CTMS and DSIC are in a key partnership</li> <li>○ This afternoon's breakouts will test the new process and framework (developed at the DSIC May Face to Face Meeting)</li> </ul> <p>George Komatsoulis provided a presentation on the caBIG™ Security Working Group (SWG), a joint working group of the DSIC and Architecture workspaces. Key highlights included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Security Basics and Infrastructure discussed</li> <li>○ SWG Roles, Activities and Priorities were reviewed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Short Term - Authentication</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p><u>Questions</u></p> <p>1. What examples of specific technology of implementation of the authentication can you provide ?  A: We don't require any particular type of Authentication Technology at sites. LDAP is acceptable, Tokens are acceptable. The SWG is working to classify what else is acceptable.</p> <p>2. With the other grids out there, are there any efforts to try to keep semantics interoperable?  A: Absolutely. Security should be independent of semantics. We anticipate complete semantic interoperability – depending on the technology stack finally adopted by the other grids. Some other communities are not as far along in devising their semantic vocabularies. So, while architecture will be completely interoperable to allow movement across grids, practically, there may be some time lag.</p> <p>3. For those participants needing to go to institutions to explain how this will work, do you have a time frame for when the information and supporting materials may be available? Specifically, all materials needed to convince the center this is okay.  A: Initial security operating policies are close to being completed, estimated July 2007 delivery date. The goal is to have the three bundles of materials available in their first iteration format around the end of this calendar year. Parts are already in existence, but the package is still a work in progress.</p> <p>4. During the discussion, we seem to group issues into two categories - Regulatory Legal issues vs. Technical issues. There is a concern to make sure that we do not forget potential scientific implications as well; It would be helpful to find a point in which to plug in the scientific issues.  A: That issue can be grouped in with the proprietary considerations that are being discussed. This is</p>

	<p>similar to the need to protect data and the reasons to protect it – timing, etc. There are only two SIGs in DSIC and there is no plan to change this.</p> <p>Comment: This is part of the value of intellectual property discussions that are going on in the community.</p> <p>Comment: Concerns around combining data across trials are also a concern (along with timing). This highlights the importance of also publishing metadata with the data.</p> <p>5. Where do we stand with the relationship with CRIX and FIREBIRD?</p> <p>A: SWG has no interactions with CRIX and FIREBIRD. The SWG is focused on the NCI and caGrid. To the extent to which these things become standards, then they will be considered. These activities are not completely separate as they take place within caBIG™, however, there is a private sector component to CRIX which the government must respect.</p>									
<b>Requirements</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Req. #</th><th>Name</th><th>Description</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Req. #	Name	Description						
Req. #	Name	Description								
<b>Issues</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Issue ID</th><th>Description</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Issue ID	Description							
Issue ID	Description									
<b>Action Items</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Assigned To</th><th>Description</th><th>Due Date</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Assigned To	Description	Due Date						
Assigned To	Description	Due Date								
<b>Attendance</b>	<p>This session was not a breakout session and was attended by all present at the meeting on Day 1.</p>									